



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"tranquilly ignore the world-wide economic struggle for existence." They are keenly alive to it. But they have chosen their own point of attack which seems to them the most advantageous. They are painfully aware of the increased hardness and bitterness of this struggle brought on by the ever-growing burdens of militarism, which are felt almost exclusively by the agricultural and laboring classes. They believe that the overthrow of militarism will at once greatly relieve the strain of the economic struggle for existence, and that the changed ideas and dispositions which shall have brought about this overthrow will at once turn the attention of governments, hitherto too much occupied with international quarrels, to the promotion of the internal welfare of the peoples, either in the ways suggested by the socialists and nationalists, or in other ways which the growing wisdom of men shall have discovered to be wisest.

If "the promoters of the universal peace societies" can succeed in accomplishing, or even aiding a little in accomplishing, this great consummation, to which so many other workers are contributing their best service in their own way, they will have no desire for a monument on Boston Common which may be seen from Mr. Bellamy's air-ships of the future, for they will already have erected to themselves a monument which will have satisfied their loftiest ambition.

A CASE OF MILITARY CRUELTY.

We are accustomed to read of harsh and cruel treatment to which soldiers are often subjected in various parts of Europe for petit offenses against military law, but the following story from Chicago is the equal of almost any of them:

On the 22d of October Charles Hammond, a private in the United States Army, "guant and thin, showing plainly the effects of his fourteen days' confinement on bread and water diet in the guard-house at Fort Sheridan," gave under oath, before a board of inquiry, the following circumstances of his disobedience of the orders of Captain Lovering and of the severe and heartless measures taken by that official to enforce his commands:

"On Friday I refused to go to work and was ordered from the guard-room into a cell. Saturday I was told that I would have to appear before a court of inquiry. I told the officers of the guard that they would have to carry me there. Captain Lovering came with two members of the guard, and orders were given to drag me out. This was done. As I went through the guard-room Captain Lovering put his heel over my head and threatened to stamp me in the face. Then I was allowed to walk back to my cell. Later Captain Lovering returned to my cell with four sentries, and gave the order 'Go in and jerk that man out.' Two of the sentries stepped in and threw me to the floor.

"Captain Lovering kicked me in the side while I was down four times with his foot, and as I was dragged over the door sill he gave me a violent kick on the shoulder. He slapped me over the right side to the left, and prodded me twice with his foot, and gave me three more

violent kicks about the shoulders. During this scene he cursed me constantly, using the most vile oaths. Lovering then ordered a rope, and gave orders to have my feet tied. I placed my hands behind my head. Then Lovering and the sentries began to drag me. He prodded me in the right hand with his sword and then in the shoulder.

"I was dragged to the guard-room and out to the porch, where with one hard jerk they started me down the stone steps on my back, across the road. I was dragged over pavements and roads to company D's steps, up the steps, then down again, across the pavement, and finally up into the adjutant's office. Lieut.-Col. Bainbridge ordered the rope untied just as I was called before the court.

"At 2 o'clock I asked to be taken to the hospital, where the doctor sponged the blood from the sword stabs. On Monday I was called before Captain Richards, and have since been in solitary confinement on bread and water."

Being asked why he left his barracks at Plattsburg, N. Y., Mr. Hammond replied: "I had some private business in Chicago, and as the inspector-general was at the barracks I knew the request for release would be refused. I had no intention of deserting, and reported at Fort Sheridan so as not to be so ranked."

When Captain Lovering was called he made no attempt to deny any of the accusing witness' statements. He admitted that by his orders Mr. Hammond had been dragged from the guard-house, and that he had pricked him with his sword; also that he had struck the soldier. None of this treatment, Captain Lovering said, had injured Hammond in the least. The methods used were, in his opinion, necessary for the discipline of the army.

From later reports it appears that the court of inquiry has upheld Captain Lovering's action. Comment on this incident is needless. According to the law and the ethics of militarism "such methods are necessary for the discipline of the army"! Discipline, obedience, must be had at all costs, cruel physical inflictions if they be necessary, and if they do not accomplish the end, then death as the ultimatum! That is the inexorable law under whose reign personal freedom has no meaning, even here in America! The "most vile oaths" which went along with this treatment probably did not receive the attention of the court of inquiry, as they were of entirely minor significance!

SAMUEL J. MAY.

The one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel J. May was celebrated at Syracuse, N. Y., on the 20th of October. It is a little curious that, in these days when the arbitration and peace movement has become the foremost movement of the time and is assuming such world-wide proportions, no place should have been made on the program of the celebration for this important subject. Two of the speakers, Rev. Joseph May of Philadelphia, and Mr. Joseph A. Allen of Medfield, Mass., alluded incidentally to this part of Mr. May's reform work, but the subject, either from neglect or from intention, was excluded from the program. His abolition work, his

labors in the temperance cause, in the interests of education and of woman's suffrage all had eloquent speakers to present them, but peace was left outside the door.

Nothing could have grieved Mr. May more than this omission, for his peace principles were the root out of which all his efforts for the breaking down of the various forms of human slavery sprang. In the days when the peace cause was in its infancy and had but few friends, when it took the utmost courage of a man's being to face the opposition of the militaristic *atmosphere* everywhere overspreading the world, Samuel J. May uttered, with his characteristic sincerity and directness, the whole of his belief on this great subject. Like Garrison and Whittier, with whom he formed the early New England trio of anti-slavery reform, he declared, in terms which had no double meaning, that war in every shape is inhuman and unchristian. He declined to do militia service and would not take part in Fourth of July and other patriotic demonstrations unless assured that there were to be no military displays. He connected himself with the American Peace Society, soon after it removed its headquarters to Boston in 1837, and remained connected with it most of the time afterwards until his death in 1871. For several years, beginning about 1839, he was one of the most active and earnest of its Board of Directors, delivering addresses in Boston and elsewhere whose plainness of speech must have terrified the timid and angered those who still believed war to be a good and glorious thing.

The passage from Mr. May's speeches which we quote on our front page sufficiently sets forth his views of the incompatibility of Christianity with war. Here is another passage, which he wrote in 1846, whose analytic clearness and boldness of utterance will probably frighten some of our good peace men to-day whose sentiments may not be so radical. It sounds like a heavy discharge from the biggest moral Krupp against the relentless tyranny of militarism :

"There is no assumption on earth which so boldly sets itself up above God as the assumption of military commanders. They require of those who have submitted themselves, or who have been subjected by force to their authority — they require of them implicit obedience. Safer is it for a soldier to disobey all the laws of God than to disregard the commands of the military chieftain. No soldier is allowed to have a will or a conscience of his own. He must do what he is ordered to do, whether he thinks it right or wrong. No trait of character would be more troublesome to a soldier, or more likely to hinder his rise in the profession, than a tender conscience that impelled him to scrutinize the commands of his superiors. And yet how many of these commands contravene the commands of God! 'Thou shalt not kill,' said the Most High; but murder is the specific work of soldiers, to which if they do not go voluntarily they are spurred by the bayonet. 'Recompense to no man evil for evil,' 'avenge not yourselves.' But the very object of an army is to make reprisals upon an offending party, to take vengeance for real or supposed injuries. 'If thine enemy

hunger feed him; if he thirst give him drink.' But says the military law of our country, if you do so, if you comfort an enemy, you shall be adjudged guilty of high treason and punished accordingly. Such is the training by which men are converted into soldiers. Such is the machinery by which masses of human beings are compacted into a great instrument of war, and wielded to accomplish its purpose, the destruction of human life, and scattering of ruin and desolation over a land at the will of those daring mortals by whom the dread instrument is directed."

Mr. May did not write thus from any hatred of military men and soldiers, but from his abhorrence of a system inflicting such absolute slavery and leading to such inhuman deeds. He was accustomed to quote approvingly Dr. Franklin's saying, "The slavery of the soldier is worse than the slavery of the negro," and he did not abandon his opposition to the one kind of slavery in order to aid by violence to put an end to the other. Mr. May was one of the tenderest and gentlest of men, his intense opposition to all forms of wrong springing from his deep and sincere love for all men. Love of the human brotherhood was the great motive of all his reform work. The noblest tribute which can be paid to any man is that which Hon. Andrew D. White, in a letter read at this Syracuse celebration, paid to Samuel J. May. He said that if Christ had come to Syracuse during the life time of Samuel J. May, his would have been the house in which he would have taken up his abode.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Unexpectedly and unaccountably, so far as we can make out, Great Britain has declined to take part in the Seal Conference at Washington with representatives from Russia and Japan. This action of the British government probably grows out of the feeling that our government is trying to outwit it in the seal affair. But there is no ground for this suspicion. The sole purpose of the United States in reference to the matter, since the Paris arbitration, has been to try to bring about an arrangement which will preserve the seal herd from destruction, which the regulations made at Paris have failed to do. It has become clear that no arrangement for their protection will be complete without the coöperation of both Russia and Japan, and for this reason only did our government desire to have representatives of these countries present at a conference. It is recognized everywhere in this country, since the Paris award, that the Canadians have the same right to take seals in the open sea that our citizens have to take them on land. So have the Russian and Japanese sealers. The surprise in this country at the action of England is all the greater because when Mr. Foster came home it was with the assurance that representatives would be sent by the British government, to whom he had explained fully the reasons for inviting Russia and Japan. However, diplomacy is very fertile